KAUFF MCCLAIN &
MCGUIRE LLP
ONE POST STREET
SUITE 2600
5AN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

KAUFF MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET **SUITE 2600** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

The Motion for Class Certification filed by Plaintiffs Kassondra Baas and Kelly Lofquist ("Plaintiffs") and opposed by Defendant Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.'s ("Dollar Tree) came on for hearing in the above-entitled action on April 4, 2008, at 9:00 a.m., before this Court, the Honorable Jeffrey S. White presiding. Maureen McClain, Kauff, McClain & McGuire LLP, appeared as attorney for Dollar Tree, and Jeremy R. Fietz, appeared as attorney for Plaintiffs.

After considering the moving and opposition papers, evidence and arguments of the parties, and all other matters presented to the Court, class certification is denied because plaintiffs cannot satisfy the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(4) and (b)(3). Specifically, commonality is lacking because Plaintiffs can point to no common fact to support their allegation that Dollar Tree improperly altered time clock records to reduce overall payroll on a state-wide basis. See Castle v. Wells Fargo Financial, Inc., 2008 WL 495705 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20. 2008). Nor are Plaintiffs' claims typical of the class. Both Plaintiffs experienced time adjustments well in excess of that experienced by a typical employee. See Crandall Decl. at ¶¶ 17-22.

In addition, Rule 23(a)(4) the Plaintiffs do not fairly and adequately protect the interests of the putative class. See Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 1998). Since Plaintiffs and other Assistant Managers were charged with the responsibility of ensuring the accuracy of subordinate hourly employees' time records. they cannot adequately represent a combined class of all hourly employees.

Finally, Plaintiffs have not established the requirements Rule 23(b). Rule 23(b)(1)(A) authorizes class actions to eliminate the possibility of adjudications in which the defendant will be required to follow inconsistent courses of continuing conduct. This danger exists in those situations in which the defendant by reason of the legal relations involved can not, as a practical matter, pursue two different courses of conduct. There is no such danger here. Nor is this a case where common issues predominate. Local

KAUFF MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP
ONE POST STREET
SUITE 2600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

ΓELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

CASE NO. C 07-03108 JSW